

INVARIANT GENERATORS FOR GENERALIZED DISTRIBUTIONS AND APPLICATIONS

M. JOTZ AND T.S. RATIU

ABSTRACT. The existence of invariant generators for locally finitely generated distributions satisfying a mild compatibility condition with the symmetry algebra is proved. This is applied to regular standard Dirac reduction.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Generalities on distributions and smooth annihilators	2
2.1. Smooth and pointwise annihilators	2
2.2. Properties of Lie group actions	4
3. Invariant generators for distributions	4
3.1. The theorem	4
3.2. The proof	5
4. Applications	13
4.1. Regular Dirac Reduction	13
4.2. Further applications	16
References	17

1. INTRODUCTION

If a smooth manifold M is acted upon in a proper way by a Lie group G , the space of orbits M/G has the structure of a stratified space. If the action is free or with conjugated isotropy subgroups, the quotient M/G is known to be a smooth manifold and the quotient map $\pi : M \rightarrow M/G$ a smooth surjective submersion. In the first case, a free and proper action is induced on the tangent space TM and on the cotangent space T^*M , but in the case of conjugated isotropies, the isotropy subgroups of the induced action on the tangent space are not necessarily conjugated (see [RO06] for a complete characterization of the isotropy lattice of the lifted action).

If a subdistribution of the Pontryagin bundle $\mathbf{P} := TM \oplus T^*M$ is invariant under the lift of the G -action on the manifold, how can we decide if this distribution has invariant sections? The existence of invariant generators would imply that the generalized distribution, assumed that its cotangent part annihilates the vertical space of the action, pushes forward to a smooth generalized distribution on the quotient M/G . In this note, we present a theorem giving sufficient conditions for a locally finitely generated generalized distribution to be spanned by sections pushing forward to the quotient. This property has its origins in control theory and the first results in this direction were obtained in [NvdS90] and [CT89].

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 70H45, 70G65.

Key words and phrases. Dirac structures, Lie group action, regular reduction.

Supported by a swiss NSF font.

Partially supported by a swiss NSF font.

The paper is organized as follows. Background on smooth generalized distributions is reviewed in Section 2. Special emphasis is given to the notion of pointwise and smooth annihilators since these are essential tools for the rest of the paper. The main theorem of the paper, guaranteeing, under certain assumptions, the existence of generators of generalized distributions that push forward to the quotient, is proved in Section 3. Applications of the theorem are given in Section 4. It is shown that regular Dirac reduction is possible under hypotheses that are weaker than those in the current literature. Several situations in which the existence of descending sections is necessary are also presented.

Conventions and notations. In this note the Lie group G is always assumed to be connected; $\mathfrak{g}$ denotes its Lie algebra and $\exp : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow G$ the exponential map.

If M is a smooth manifold, $C^\infty(M)$ denotes the sheaf of *local* functions on M , that is, an element $f \in C^\infty(M)$ is, by definition, a smooth function $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where the domain of definition U of f is an open subset of M . Similarly, if E is a vector bundle over M , or a generalized distribution on M , $\Gamma(E)$ denotes the set of smooth *local* sections of E . In particular, the sets of smooth local vector fields and one-forms on M are denoted by $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ and $\Omega^1(M)$, respectively. The open domain of definition of the local section σ of E is denoted by $\text{Dom}(\sigma)$.

Let $\Phi : G \times M \rightarrow M$ be a smooth left action of the Lie group G on the manifold M . A section X (respectively α) of TM (respectively T^*M) is said to be *G-invariant* if $\Phi_g^* X = X$ (respectively $\Phi_g^* \alpha = \alpha$) for all $g \in G$, where $\Phi : G \times M \rightarrow M$ is the action of G on M . Here, the vector field $\Phi_g^* X$ is defined by $\Phi_g^* X = T\Phi_{g^{-1}} \circ X \circ \Phi_g$, that is, $(\Phi_g^* X)(m) = T_{gm} \Phi_{g^{-1}} X(gm)$ for all $m \in M$. The infinitesimal generator of the action defined by $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$, denoted by ξ_M (a global section of TM), is defined by $\xi_M(m) := \frac{d}{dt} \big|_{t=0} \Phi(\exp(t\xi), m)$

2. GENERALITIES ON DISTRIBUTIONS AND SMOOTH ANNIHILATORS

2.1. Smooth and pointwise annihilators. The *Pontryagin bundle* $\mathbf{P} := TM \oplus T^*M$ of a smooth manifold M is endowed with a non-degenerate symmetric fiberwise bilinear form of signature $(\dim M, \dim M)$ given by

$$(1) \quad \langle (u_m, \alpha_m), (v_m, \beta_m) \rangle := \langle \beta_m, u_m \rangle + \langle \alpha_m, v_m \rangle$$

for all $u_m, v_m \in T_m M$ and $\alpha_m, \beta_m \in T_m^* M$.

A *generalized distribution* is a subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbf{P} = TM \oplus T^*M$ such that for each $m \in M$, the set $\Delta(m) := \Delta \cap \mathbf{P}(m)$ is a vector subspace of $\mathbf{P}(m) = T_m M \oplus T_m^* M$. The number $\dim \Delta(m)$ is called the *rank* of Δ at $m \in M$. A point $m \in M$ is a *regular* point of the distribution Δ if there exists a neighborhood U of m such that the rank of Δ is constant on U . Otherwise, m is a *singular* point of the distribution.

A *local differentiable section* of Δ is a smooth section $\sigma \in \Gamma(\mathbf{P}) = \mathfrak{X}(M) \times \Omega^1(M)$ defined on some open subset $U \subset M$ such that $\sigma(u) \in \Delta(u)$ for each $u \in U$; $\Gamma(\Delta)$ denotes the space of local differentiable sections of Δ . A generalized distribution is said to be *differentiable* or *smooth* if for every point $m \in M$ and every $v \in \Delta(m)$, there is a differentiable section $\sigma \in \Gamma(\Delta)$ defined on an open neighborhood U of m such that $\sigma(m) = v$. The generalized distribution Δ is said to be *locally finitely generated* if for each point $m \in M$ there exists a neighborhood U of m and smooth sections $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k \in \Gamma(\mathbf{P})$ defined on U such that for all m' in U we have

$$\Delta(m') = \text{span}\{\sigma_1(m'), \dots, \sigma_k(m')\}.$$

Note that a locally finitely generated distribution is necessarily smooth.

If $\Delta \subset \mathbf{P}$ is a smooth distribution, its *smooth orthogonal* distribution (or simply its *smooth orthogonal*) is the smooth generalized distribution $\Delta^\perp \subseteq \mathbf{P}$ defined by

$$\Delta^\perp(m) := \left\{ (X(m), \alpha(m)) \left| \begin{array}{l} (X, \alpha) \in \mathfrak{X}(M) \times \Omega^1(M) \text{ with } m \in \\ \text{Dom}(X) \cap \text{Dom}(\alpha) \text{ such that for all} \\ (Y, \beta) \in \mathfrak{X}(M) \times \Omega^1(M) \\ \text{with } m \in \text{Dom}(Y) \cap \text{Dom}(\beta), \\ \text{we have } \langle (X, \alpha), (Y, \beta) \rangle = 0 \\ \text{on } \text{Dom}(X) \cap \text{Dom}(Y) \cap \text{Dom}(\alpha) \cap \text{Dom}(\beta) \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

In general, the inclusion $\Delta \subset \Delta^{\perp\perp}$ is strict. The smooth orthogonal of a smooth generalized distribution is smooth by construction. If the distribution Δ is a vector subbundle of $\mathbf{P}$, then its smooth orthogonal distribution is also a vector subbundle of $\mathbf{P}$. Note also that the smooth orthogonal of a smooth generalized distribution Δ is, in general, different from the *pointwise* orthogonal distribution of Δ , defined by

$$\Delta^{\perp p}(m) := \{\sigma_m \in \mathbf{P}(m) \mid \langle \sigma_m, \tau_m \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } \tau_m \in \Delta(m)\},$$

where the subscript p stands for “pointwise”. The pointwise orthogonal of a smooth generalized distribution Δ is not smooth, in general. The following statement is an immediate consequence of the definitions.

Proposition 1. *Let Δ be a smooth generalized distribution. Then we have*

$$\Delta^\perp \subseteq \Delta^{\perp p}, \quad \Delta = \Delta^{\perp p \perp p}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta \subseteq \Delta^{\perp\perp}.$$

If Δ is itself a vector bundle over M , the smooth orthogonal distribution $\Delta^\perp$ of Δ is also a vector subbundle of $\mathbf{P}$, and we have $\Delta^\perp = \Delta^{\perp p}$.

This implies the following property of the smooth annihilator of a sum of vector subbundles of $\mathbf{P}$; its proof is easy and can be found in [JRS09].

Proposition 2. *Let Δ_1 and Δ_2 be vector subbundles of the vector bundle $(\mathbf{P}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$. Since Δ_1 and Δ_2 have constant rank on M , their smooth orthogonals $\Delta_1^\perp$ and $\Delta_2^\perp$ are also vector subbundles of $\mathbf{P}$ and equal to the pointwise orthogonals of Δ_1 and Δ_2 . The intersection $\Delta_1^\perp \cap \Delta_2^\perp$ is smooth if and only if it has locally constant rank.*

A tangent (respectively cotangent) distribution $\mathcal{T} \subseteq TM$ (respectively $\mathcal{C} \subseteq T^*M$) can be identified with the smooth generalized distribution $\mathcal{T} \oplus \{0\}$ (respectively $\{0\} \oplus \mathcal{C}$). The smooth orthogonal distribution of $\mathcal{T} \oplus \{0\}$ in $TM \oplus T^*M$ is easily computed to be $(\mathcal{T} \oplus \{0\})^\perp = TM \oplus \mathcal{T}^\circ$, where

$$\mathcal{T}^\circ(m) = \left\{ \alpha(m) \left| \begin{array}{l} \alpha \in \Omega^1(M), m \in \text{Dom}(\alpha) \text{ and } \alpha(X) = 0 \\ \text{on } \text{Dom}(\alpha) \cap \text{Dom}(X) \text{ for all } X \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}) \end{array} \right. \right\}$$

for all $m \in M$. This smooth cotangent distribution is called the smooth *annihilator* of $\mathcal{T}$. Analogously, we define the smooth annihilator $\mathcal{C}^\circ$ of a cotangent distribution $\mathcal{C}$. Then $\mathcal{C}^\circ$ is a smooth tangent distribution and we have $(\{0\} \oplus \mathcal{C})^\perp = \mathcal{C}^\circ \oplus T^*M$.

If a Lie group G with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ acts on the manifold M , the tangent distribution $\mathcal{V}$ whose value at each point $m \in M$ is given by

$$\mathcal{V}(m) = \{\xi_M(m) \mid \xi \in \mathfrak{g}\}$$

is called the *vertical distribution*.

If the G -action has conjugated isotropy groups, the vertical distribution is a vector subbundle of TM . The smooth annihilator $\mathcal{V}^\circ$ of $\mathcal{V}$ is given by

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{V}^\circ(m) = \{\alpha(m) \mid \alpha \in \Omega^1(M), m \in \text{Dom}(\alpha), \text{ such that } \alpha(\xi_M) = 0 \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathfrak{g}\}.$$

The smooth generalized distribution $\mathcal{K} := \mathcal{V} \oplus \{0\}$ and its smooth orthogonal $\mathcal{K}^\perp = TM \oplus \mathcal{V}^\circ$ are also needed.

2.2. Properties of Lie group actions. If the action of a Lie group G on a smooth manifold M is proper with conjugated isotropy subgroups, then the orbit space $\bar{M} := M/G$ inherits a smooth manifold structure such that the quotient map $\pi : M \rightarrow \bar{M}$ is a regular submersion. In addition, $\pi : M \rightarrow \bar{M}$ is a locally trivial fiber bundle with fiber the orbit of $G \cdot m$ and structure group $N(H)/H$, where $H = G_m$ is the isotropy group at $m \in M$ and $N(H)$ its normalizer. Since all isotropy groups are conjugated, the previous statement is independent of m .

The next proposition, proved in [JRS09], states that the vector fields leaving the vertical subbundle $\mathcal{V} \subseteq TM$ invariant under the Lie bracket *push-forward* to the quotient.

Proposition 3. *Assume that the connected Lie group G acts properly on the smooth manifold M and that all its isotropy subgroups are conjugated. Let $\mathcal{V} \subseteq TM$ be the vertical subbundle of this action. If $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is a smooth vector field satisfying $[X, \Gamma(\mathcal{V})] \subseteq \Gamma(\mathcal{V})$, then there exists $\bar{X} \in \mathfrak{X}(\bar{M})$ such that $X \sim_\pi \bar{X}$, and hence X can be written as a sum $X = X^G + X^\mathcal{V}$ with $X^G \in \mathfrak{X}(M)^G$ and $X^\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{V}$.*

If α is a G -invariant local section of T^*M annihilating the vertical spaces $\mathcal{V}(m)$ for all $m \in \text{Dom}(\alpha)$, then there exists a unique $\bar{\alpha} \in \Omega^1(\bar{M})$ such that $\alpha = \pi^* \bar{\alpha}$. A local section (X, α) of $TM \oplus \mathcal{V}^\circ = \mathcal{K}^\perp$ satisfying $[X, \Gamma(\mathcal{V})] \subseteq \Gamma(\mathcal{V})$ and $\alpha \in \Gamma(\mathcal{V}^\circ)^G$ is called a *descending section* of $\mathbf{P}$. Note that for each pair $(\bar{X}, \bar{\alpha})$ in $\mathfrak{X}(\bar{M}) \times \Omega^1(\bar{M})$, there exists a descending section (X, α) of $\mathbf{P}$ projecting to it. Indeed, α is simply defined as the pull-back $\pi^* \bar{\alpha}$, and $X = X^G + V$, where V is an arbitrary section of $\mathcal{V}$, and X^G is the G -invariant vector field that is π -related to $\bar{X}$; the existence of X^G is proved, for example, in [Dui].

3. INVARIANT GENERATORS FOR DISTRIBUTIONS

3.1. The theorem. We present here a theorem which can help to decide if a locally finitely generated distribution is spanned by its descending sections. The proof is inspired by [CT89].

The space $\Gamma(TM \oplus T^*M)$ of local sections of the Pontryagin bundle is endowed with a skew-symmetric bracket given by

$$\begin{aligned} [(X, \alpha), (Y, \beta)] &:= \left([X, Y], \mathcal{L}_X \beta - \mathcal{L}_Y \alpha + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{d}(\alpha(Y) - \beta(X)) \right) \\ (3) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \left([X, Y], \mathcal{L}_X \beta - \mathbf{i}_Y \mathbf{d} \alpha - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{d} \langle (X, \alpha), (Y, \beta) \rangle \right) \end{aligned}$$

(see [Cou90]). This bracket is $\mathbb{R}$ -bilinear (in the sense that $[a_1(X_1, \alpha_1) + a_2(X_2, \alpha_2), (Y, \beta)] = a_1[(X_1, \alpha_1), (Y, \beta)] + a_2[(X_2, \alpha_2), (Y, \beta)]$ for all $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(X_1, \alpha_1), (X_2, \alpha_2), (Y, \beta) \in \Gamma(TM \oplus T^*M)$ on the common domain of definition of the three sections) and does not satisfy the Jacobi identity.

Let $\mathcal{J} \subseteq TM$ be a smooth tangent distribution. If $(Y, 0)$ is a local section of $\mathcal{J} \oplus \{0\} \subseteq TM \oplus T^*M$ and (X, α) a local section of $TM \oplus \mathcal{J}^\circ$, using $\alpha(Y) = 0$ we get

$$(4) \qquad [(Y, 0), (X, \alpha)] = \left([Y, X], \mathcal{L}_Y \alpha + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{d}(-\alpha(Y)) \right) = (\mathcal{L}_Y X, \mathcal{L}_Y \alpha).$$

Note also that

$$(5) \qquad [(Y, 0), f(X, \alpha)] = (\mathcal{L}_Y f)(X, \alpha) + f[(Y, 0), (X, \alpha)]$$

for all $f \in C^\infty(M)$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{J} \subseteq TM$ be an involutive vector subbundle of TM and $\mathcal{D} \subseteq TM \oplus \mathcal{J}^\circ$ a locally finitely generated generalized distribution on M . Let $\Theta := \mathcal{J} \oplus \{0\} \subseteq TM \oplus T^*M$. Assume that*

$$(6) \qquad [\Gamma(\mathcal{D}), \Gamma(\Theta)] \subseteq \Gamma(\Theta + \mathcal{D}).$$

Let (X, α) be a local section of $TM \oplus \mathcal{J}^\circ$ satisfying

$$(7) \qquad [(X, \alpha), \Gamma(\Theta)] \subseteq \Gamma(\Theta + \mathcal{D}).$$

Then for each $m \in M$ there exist an open set $U \subseteq M$ with $m \in U$ and smooth sections (Z, γ) , $(Z_1, \gamma_1), \dots, (Z_r, \gamma_r)$ of $\mathcal{D}$, defined on U and satisfying

- (i) $\mathcal{D}(m') = \text{span}\{(Z_1(m'), \gamma_1(m')), \dots, (Z_r(m'), \gamma_r(m'))\}$ for all $m' \in U$,
- (ii) $[(Z_i, \gamma_i), \Gamma(\Theta)] \subseteq \Gamma(\Theta)$ on U for all $i = 1, \dots, r$, and
- (iii) $[(X, \alpha) + (Z, \gamma), \Gamma(\Theta)] \subseteq \Gamma(\Theta)$ on U .

3.2. The proof. This is a long proof and so it will be broken up in four steps. Since the statement is local, we work in a foliated chart of $\mathcal{J}$. We choose a spanning set of local sections of $\mathcal{D}$ and write its elements as a sum of a component tangent to the leaves of $\mathcal{J}$ and the rest. The main work is the analysis of this second component. The r local sections spanning locally $\mathcal{D}$ in the theorem are constructed from an initially chosen spanning set of local sections of $\mathcal{D}$ using in an essential way the information gathered about their second component. In the first step we construct a family of linear systems for the derivatives (along the leaves of $\mathcal{J}$) of these second components. Using specific properties of this system, in the second step, we linearly transform the second components in order to get pairs formed by a vector field and a one-form that are independent of the coordinates of the leaves of $\mathcal{J}$. In the third step, we extend this linear transformation to the spanning set of local sections of $\mathcal{D}$ and, using the property found in the previous step, r sections of $\mathcal{D}$ are constructed that satisfy the first two properties in the statement. In the fourth step an additional section of $\mathcal{D}$ is constructed that satisfies the third property in the statement.

Step 1: Construction of the linear system. Let $n := \dim M$ and $k := \dim \mathcal{J}(x)$, for $x \in M$. Since the vector subbundle $\mathcal{J}$ is involutive, it is integrable by the Frobenius Theorem and thus any $m \in M$ lies in a foliated chart domain U_1 described by coordinates $(x^1, \dots, x^n)$ such that the first k among them define the local integral submanifold containing m . Thus, for any $m' \in U_1$ the basis vector fields $\partial_{x^1}, \dots, \partial_{x^k}$ evaluated at m' span $\mathcal{J}(m')$.

Because $\mathcal{D}$ is locally finitely generated, we can find on a sufficiently small neighborhood $U \subseteq U_1$ of m smooth sections $(X_1, \alpha^1), \dots, (X_r, \alpha^r)$ spanning $\mathcal{D}$, i.e., for all $m' \in U$ we have

$$\mathcal{D}(m') = \text{span}\{(X_1(m'), \alpha^1(m')), \dots, (X_r(m'), \alpha^r(m'))\}.$$

Write, for $i = 1, \dots, r$,

$$(X_i, \alpha^i) = \sum_{j=1}^n (X_i^j \partial_{x^j}, \alpha_j^i \mathbf{d}x^j),$$

with X_i^j and α_j^i smooth local functions defined on U for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Note that $\alpha_1^i = \dots = \alpha_k^i = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$, since $\alpha^i \in \Gamma(\mathcal{J}^\circ)$. By hypothesis (6) and with $\partial_{x^l} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{J})$ for $l = 1, \dots, k$, we get for all $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $l = 1, \dots, k$:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x^l}(X_i, \alpha^i) &:= [(\partial_{x^l}, 0), (X_i, \alpha^i)] = ([\partial_{x^l}, X_i], \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{x^l}} \alpha^i) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\partial_{x^l}(X_i^j) \partial_{x^j}, \partial_{x^l}(\alpha_j^i) \mathbf{d}x^j \right) \in \Gamma(\Theta + \mathcal{D}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we can write

$$\partial_{x^l}(X_i, \alpha^i) = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\partial_{x^l}(X_i^j) \partial_{x^j}, \partial_{x^l}(\alpha_j^i) \mathbf{d}x^j \right) = \sum_{j=1}^k A_{li}^j (\partial_{x^j}, 0) + \sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i (X_s, \alpha^s)$$

with $A_{li}^j, B_{ls}^i \in C^\infty(U)$ for $i, s = 1, \dots, r$ and $l, j = 1, \dots, k$. Setting

$$(\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{\alpha}^i) := \sum_{j=k+1}^n (X_i^j \partial_{x^j}, \alpha_j^i \mathbf{d}x^j)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, r$, we get

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_{x^l}(\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{\alpha}^i) &:= \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), (\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{\alpha}^i) \right] = \sum_{j=k+1}^n \left(\partial_{x^l}(X_i^j) \partial_{x^j}, \partial_{x^l}(\alpha_j^i) \mathbf{d}x^j \right) \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i(\tilde{X}_s, \tilde{\alpha}^s). \end{aligned}$$

We verify the last equality. Since $\alpha_j^s = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $s = 1, \dots, r$, we have for any $i = 1, \dots, r$, $l = 1, \dots, k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x^l}(X_i, \alpha^i) &= \sum_{m=1}^k (\partial_{x^l}(X_i^m) \partial_{x^m}, 0) + \sum_{j=k+1}^n \left(\partial_{x^l}(X_i^j) \partial_{x^j}, \partial_{x^l}(\alpha_j^i) \mathbf{d}x^j \right) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^k A_{li}^m(\partial_{x^m}, 0) + \sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i(X_s, \alpha^s) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^k A_{li}^m(\partial_{x^m}, 0) + \sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i \sum_{j=1}^n (X_s^j \partial_{x^j}, \alpha_j^s \mathbf{d}x^j) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^k A_{li}^m(\partial_{x^m}, 0) + \sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i \sum_{m=1}^k (X_s^m \partial_{x^m}, 0) + \sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i \sum_{j=k+1}^n (X_s^j \partial_{x^j}, \alpha_j^s \mathbf{d}x^j) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^k \left(A_{li}^m + \sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i X_s^m \right) (\partial_{x^m}, 0) + \sum_{j=k+1}^n \left(\left(\sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i X_s^j \right) \partial_{x^j}, \left(\sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i \alpha_j^s \right) \mathbf{d}x^j \right) \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$(9) \quad \partial_{x^l}(X_i^m) = A_{li}^m + \sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i X_s^m, \quad \text{for all } l, m = 1, \dots, k, \quad i = 1, \dots, r$$

$$(10) \quad \partial_{x^l}(X_i^j) = \sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i X_s^j \quad \text{for all } l = 1, \dots, k, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad j = k+1, \dots, n$$

$$(11) \quad \partial_{x^l}(\alpha_j^i) = \sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i \alpha_j^s \quad \text{for all } l = 1, \dots, k, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad j = k+1, \dots, n.$$

Using (10) and (11) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x^l}(\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{\alpha}^i) &= \sum_{j=k+1}^n \left(\partial_{x^l}(X_i^j) \partial_{x^j}, \partial_{x^l}(\alpha_j^i) \mathbf{d}x^j \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=k+1}^n \left(\left(\sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i X_s^j \right) \partial_{x^j}, \left(\sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i \alpha_j^s \right) \mathbf{d}x^j \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=k+1}^n \sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i (X_s^j \partial_{x^j}, \alpha_j^s \mathbf{d}x^j) = \sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i \sum_{j=k+1}^n (X_s^j \partial_{x^j}, \alpha_j^s \mathbf{d}x^j) \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^r B_{ls}^i(\tilde{X}_s, \tilde{\alpha}^s) \end{aligned}$$

which proves (8). Note that (9) gives a formula for $\partial_{x^l}(X_i^m)$ for all $l, m = 1, \dots, k$ and $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Step2: Construction of an $r \times r$ -matrix B such that $\left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}^1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}^r)\right) B$ does not depend on $x^1, \dots, x^k$. We rewrite the system (8) in the form

$$(12) \quad \left(\partial_{x^l} \left(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}^1\right), \dots, \partial_{x^l} \left(\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}^r\right)\right) = \left(\left(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}^1\right), \dots, \left(\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}^r\right)\right) B_l,$$

where $B_l := [B_{ls}^i]$ is the $r \times r$ matrix whose entry $B_{ls}^i \in C^\infty(U)$ is the intersection of the i -th column and the s -th row ($i, j = 1, \dots, r$). In view of (10), (11), this system can be explicitly written as

$$\partial_{x^l} \begin{bmatrix} X_1^{k+1} & \dots & X_r^{k+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ X_1^n & \dots & X_r^n \\ \alpha_{k+1}^1 & \dots & \alpha_{k+1}^r \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \alpha_n^1 & \dots & \alpha_n^r \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X_1^{k+1} & \dots & X_r^{k+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ X_1^n & \dots & X_r^n \\ \alpha_{k+1}^1 & \dots & \alpha_{k+1}^r \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \alpha_n^1 & \dots & \alpha_n^r \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_{l1}^1 & B_{l1}^2 & \dots & B_{l1}^r \\ B_{l2}^1 & B_{l2}^2 & \dots & B_{l2}^r \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ B_{lr}^1 & B_{lr}^2 & \dots & B_{lr}^r \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$(13) \quad \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}^1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}^r)\right) = \begin{bmatrix} X_1^{k+1} & \dots & X_r^{k+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ X_1^n & \dots & X_r^n \\ \alpha_{k+1}^1 & \dots & \alpha_{k+1}^r \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \alpha_n^1 & \dots & \alpha_n^r \end{bmatrix}.$$

Equivalently, taking the transpose of this system, we get

$$(14) \quad \partial_{x^l} \begin{bmatrix} X_1^{k+1} & \dots & X_1^n & \alpha_{k+1}^1 & \dots & \alpha_n^1 \\ X_2^{k+1} & \dots & X_2^n & \alpha_{k+1}^2 & \dots & \alpha_n^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ X_r^{k+1} & \dots & X_r^n & \alpha_{k+1}^r & \dots & \alpha_n^r \end{bmatrix} = B_l^\top \begin{bmatrix} X_1^{k+1} & \dots & X_1^n & \alpha_{k+1}^1 & \dots & \alpha_n^1 \\ X_2^{k+1} & \dots & X_2^n & \alpha_{k+1}^2 & \dots & \alpha_n^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ X_r^{k+1} & \dots & X_r^n & \alpha_{k+1}^r & \dots & \alpha_n^r \end{bmatrix}$$

Now fix $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, think of x^j as a time variable and all the other x^i , $i \neq j$, as parameters. Consider the following linear ordinary differential equation on $\mathbb{R}^r$, where the solutions Y depend smoothly on the parameters $x^1, \dots, x^{j-1}, x^{j+1}, \dots, x^n$:

$$(15) \quad \partial_{x^j} Y = B_j^\top Y.$$

Let $Y_1^j, \dots, Y_r^j$ be r linearly independent solutions of (15). The $r \times r$ matrix W_j whose columns are $Y_1^j, \dots, Y_r^j$, that is, $W_j := (Y_1^j, \dots, Y_r^j)$, is invertible. However, by (14) with $l = j$, the $2(n-k)$ columns of the matrix in this system also satisfy (15) and therefore these columns are linear combinations of $Y_1^j, \dots, Y_r^j$, that is, there exists a matrix L_j having r rows and $2(n-k)$ columns such that

$$\left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}^1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}^r)\right)^\top = W_j L_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, k.$$

The entries of L_j are smooth functions of $(x^1, \dots, x^n)$ and are independent of the variable x^j (the “time” in the differential equation (15)).

Since this argument holds for any $j = 1, \dots, k$ this implies

$$(16) \quad W_1 L_1 = W_2 L_2 = \dots = W_k L_k.$$

Because W_2 is nonsingular, we have

$$L_2(x^1, \dots, x^n) = (W_2^{-1} W_1 L_1)(x^1, \dots, x^n).$$

Since L_2 is independent of x^2 and L_1 is independent of x^1 , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 (17) \quad L_2(x^1, x^2, \dots, x^n) &= L_2(x^1, 0, x^3, \dots, x^n) \\
 &= (W_2^{-1}W_1)(x^1, 0, x^3, \dots, x^n)L_1(x^1, 0, x^3, \dots, x^n) \\
 &= (W_2^{-1}W_1)(x^1, 0, x^3, \dots, x^n)L_1(0, 0, x^3, \dots, x^n).
 \end{aligned}$$

In the same manner, we have $L_3(x^1, \dots, x^n) = (W_3^{-1}W_2L_2)(x^1, \dots, x^n)$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
 L_3(x^1, \dots, x^n) &= L_3(x^1, x^2, 0, x^4, \dots, x^n) \\
 &= (W_3^{-1}W_2)(x^1, x^2, 0, x^4, \dots, x^n)L_2(x^1, x^2, 0, x^4, \dots, x^n) \\
 &\stackrel{(17)}{=} (W_3^{-1}W_2)(x^1, x^2, 0, x^4, \dots, x^n)(W_2^{-1}W_1)(x^1, 0, 0, x^4, \dots, x^n) \\
 &\quad \times L_1(0, 0, 0, x^4, \dots, x^n).
 \end{aligned}$$

By induction, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 (18) \quad L_k(x^1, \dots, x^n) &= L_k(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) \\
 &= (W_k^{-1}W_{k-1})(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) \\
 &\quad \times L_{k-1}(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) \\
 &= (W_k^{-1}W_{k-1})(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) \\
 &\quad \times (W_{k-1}^{-1}W_{k-2})(x^1, \dots, x^{k-2}, 0, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) \times \dots \\
 &\quad \times (W_3^{-1}W_2)(x^1, x^2, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) \\
 &\quad \times (W_2^{-1}W_1)(x^1, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n)L_1(0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n).
 \end{aligned}$$

Define the smooth $r \times r$ nonsingular matrix

$$\begin{aligned}
 (19) \quad H(x^1, \dots, x^n) &:= W_k(x^1, \dots, x^n)(W_k^{-1}W_{k-1})(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) \\
 &\quad \times \dots \times (W_3^{-1}W_2)(x^1, x^2, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) \\
 &\quad \times (W_2^{-1}W_1)(x^1, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n)
 \end{aligned}$$

and the smooth $r \times (2n - 2k)$ matrix

$$L(x^1, \dots, x^n) := L_1(0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n).$$

Note that L does not depend on $x^1, \dots, x^k$. Using equations (18) and (19), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 (HL)(x^1, \dots, x^n) &= H(x^1, \dots, x^n)L_1(0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) \\
 &= W_k(x^1, \dots, x^n)L_k(x^1, \dots, x^n) \\
 &= \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}^1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}^r) \right)^\top.
 \end{aligned}$$

Define the $r \times r$ nonsingular matrix B depending smoothly on $(x^1, \dots, x^n)$ by

$$(20) \quad B(x^1, \dots, x^n) := (H(x^1, \dots, x^n)^\top)^{-1} = (H(x^1, \dots, x^n)^{-1})^\top.$$

Then $\left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}^1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}^r) \right) B = L^\top$ does *not* depend on $x^1, \dots, x^k$.

Step 3: Construction of the local sections $(Z_1, \gamma_1), \dots, (Z_r, \gamma_r)$. We want to better understand the columns of this matrix. In view of (13), we can write

$$\left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}^1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}^r) \right) B = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{C} \\ \tilde{D} \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\tilde{C} = \left[\tilde{C}_{jl} \right]_{\substack{j=k+1, \dots, n \\ l=1, \dots, r}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{D} = \left[\tilde{D}_{jl} \right]_{\substack{j=k+1, \dots, n \\ l=1, \dots, r}}$$

are $(n - k) \times r$ -matrices whose entries are smooth functions of only $x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n$ (that is, they do not depend on $x^1, \dots, x^k$). Thus the i -th column of the matrix $\left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}^1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}^r) \right) B$ equals

$$(21) \quad \left(\left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}^1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}^r) \right) B \right)_i := \sum_{j=k+1}^n (\tilde{C}_{ji} \partial_{x^j}, \tilde{D}_{ji} \mathbf{d}x^j)$$

and so, by (4), we get for any $l = 1, \dots, k$ and $i = 1, \dots, r$,

$$(22) \quad \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), \left(\left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}^1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}^r) \right) B \right)_i \right] = 0.$$

Let $(Z_1, \gamma_1), \dots, (Z_r, \gamma_r)$ be the sections of $\mathcal{D} \subseteq TM \oplus \mathcal{J}^\circ$ on U defined by

$$(Z_i, \gamma_i) := \left(((X_1, \alpha^1), \dots, (X_r, \alpha^r)) B \right)_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, r,$$

where, as before, if we write

$$((X_1, \alpha^1), \dots, (X_r, \alpha^r)) B = \begin{bmatrix} X_1^1 & \dots & X_r^1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ X_1^k & \dots & X_r^k \\ X_1^{k+1} & \dots & X_r^{k+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ X_1^n & \dots & X_r^n \\ \alpha_1^1 & \dots & \alpha_r^1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \alpha_k^1 & \dots & \alpha_k^r \\ \alpha_{k+1}^1 & \dots & \alpha_{k+1}^r \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \alpha_n^1 & \dots & \alpha_n^r \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} & \dots & B_{1r} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} & \dots & B_{2r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ B_{r1} & B_{r2} & \dots & B_{rr} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ D \end{bmatrix},$$

with

$$C = [C_{jl}]_{\substack{j=1, \dots, n \\ l=1, \dots, r}} \quad \text{and} \quad D = [D_{jl}]_{\substack{j=1, \dots, n \\ l=1, \dots, r}}$$

$n \times r$ -matrices whose entries depend smoothly on all coordinates $x^1, \dots, x^n$, we have

$$\left(((X_1, \alpha^1), \dots, (X_r, \alpha^r)) B \right)_i = \sum_{j=1}^n (C_{ji} \partial_{x^j}, D_{ji} \mathbf{d}x^j).$$

Note that since $\alpha_j^i = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $j = 1, \dots, k$, we get $D_{ji} = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $j = 1, \dots, k$. Using (21), we conclude

$$Z_i = \xi_i + \mathbb{P}_{TM} \left(\left((\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_r) B \right)_i \right) = \xi_i + \sum_{j=k+1}^n C_{ji} \partial_{x^j},$$

$$\gamma_i = \mathbb{P}_{T^*M} \left(((\tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_r) B)_i \right) = \sum_{j=k+1}^n D_{ji} \mathbf{d}x^j,$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{TM}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{T^*M}$ are the projections on the vector field and one-form factors, respectively, and

$$\xi_i = \sum_{j=1}^k C_{ji} \partial_{x^j} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{J}).$$

Thus, we have for all $l = 1, \dots, k$ and $i = 1, \dots, r$,

$$(23) \quad [(\partial_{x^l}, 0), (Z_i, \gamma_i)] = [(\partial_{x^l}, 0), (\xi_i, 0)] + \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), \left(\left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) \cdot B \right)_i \right] \\ \stackrel{(22)}{=} [(\partial_{x^l}, \xi_i), 0] + 0 \in \Gamma(\Theta)$$

since $\mathcal{J} \subset TM$ is an involutive vector subbundle, by hypothesis. Hence, if we write an arbitrary section $(\eta, 0) \in \Gamma(\Theta)$ as

$$(\eta, 0) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \eta_j \partial_{x^j}, 0 \right),$$

where $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_k$ are smooth functions of $x^1, \dots, x^n$, we get for $i = 1, \dots, r$

$$[(\eta, 0), (Z_i, \gamma_i)] = \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^k \eta_j \partial_{x^j}, 0 \right), (Z_i, \gamma_i) \right] \\ = \sum_{j=1}^k \eta_j [(\partial_{x^j}, 0), (Z_i, \gamma_i)] - \sum_{j=1}^k Z_i[\eta_j](\partial_{x^j}, 0) \in \Gamma(\Theta).$$

Indeed, both terms are elements of $\Gamma(\Theta)$: the first summand by (23) and the second summand because of its form.

Thus, since by construction, $(Z_1, \gamma_1), \dots, (Z_r, \gamma_r)$ span $\mathcal{D}$ on U (because B is an invertible $r \times r$ matrix), these smooth sections of $\mathcal{D} \subseteq TM \oplus \mathcal{J}^\circ$ satisfy the first two statements of the proposition.

Step4: Construction of the local section (Z, γ) . We use the spanning set $(X_1, \alpha^1), \dots, (X_r, \alpha^r)$ of sections of $\mathcal{D}$ defined on the open subset $U \subseteq M$. Since $(X, \alpha) \in \Gamma(TM \oplus \mathcal{J}^\circ)$, it can be written in the form

$$(X, \alpha) = \sum_{j=1}^n a^j(\partial_{x^j}, 0) + \sum_{j=k+1}^n b_j(0, \mathbf{d}x^j),$$

where $a^1, \dots, a^n, b_{k+1}, \dots, b_n$ are C^∞ -functions of $x^1, \dots, x^n$. By hypothesis (7),

$$[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), (X, \alpha)] = \sum_{j=1}^n \partial_{x^l}(a^j)(\partial_{x^j}, 0) + \sum_{j=k+1}^n \partial_{x^l}(b_j)(0, \mathbf{d}x^j) \in \Gamma(\Theta + \mathcal{D})$$

for all $l = 1, \dots, k$. Thus, for each $l = 1, \dots, k$, there exist functions $\beta_l^1, \dots, \beta_l^r$ and $\sigma_l^1, \dots, \sigma_l^k$ depending smoothly on $x^1, \dots, x^n$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \partial_{x^l}(a^j)(\partial_{x^j}, 0) + \sum_{j=k+1}^n \partial_{x^l}(b_j)(0, \mathbf{d}x^j) = \sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_l^j(\partial_{x^j}, 0) + \sum_{j=1}^r \beta_l^j(X_j, \alpha^j).$$

Hence, if we define

$$(\tilde{X}, \tilde{\alpha}) := \sum_{j=k+1}^n (a^j \partial_{x^j}, b_j \mathbf{d}x^j),$$

then proceeding as in the proof of (8), we get for each $l = 1, \dots, k$,

$$(24) \quad [(\partial_{x^l}, 0), (\tilde{X}, \tilde{\alpha})] = \sum_{j=k+1}^n (\partial_{x^l}(a^j) \partial_{x^j}, \partial_{x^l}(b_j) \mathbf{d}x^j) \\ = \sum_{j=1}^r \beta_l^j(\tilde{X}_j, \tilde{\alpha}^j) = \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}^1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}^r) \right) \beta_l$$

where β_l is the $r \times 1$ matrix with entries $\beta_l^1, \dots, \beta_l^r$.

Consider the $r \times 1$ matrix of derivatives $\partial_{x^l}(H^\top \beta_j)$ for fixed $j, l = 1, \dots, k$. We consider below the product of the $2(n-k) \times r$ matrix $\left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}^1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}^r) \right) B$ with the $r \times 1$ matrix $\partial_{x^l}(H^\top \beta_j)$.

We need the conclusion of Step 2: $\left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B$ does not depend on $x^1, \dots, x^k$, that is,

$$(25) \quad 0 = \partial_{x^l} \left(\left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) B \right) = \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) B \right].$$

Therefore, the definition (20) of the matrix B , (25), and the Leibniz rule yield

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) B \partial_{x^l} (H^\top \beta_j) \\ &= \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) B \right] (H^\top \beta_j) + \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) B \partial_{x^l} (H^\top \beta_j) \\ &= \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) B H^\top \beta_j \right] \\ &= \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) \beta_j \right] = \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), \left[(\partial_{x^j}, 0), (\tilde{X}, \tilde{\alpha}) \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

However,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), \left[(\partial_{x^j}, 0), (\tilde{X}, \tilde{\alpha}) \right] \right] = \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), \left(\left[\partial_{x^j}, \tilde{X} \right], \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{x^j}} \tilde{\alpha} \right) \right] \\ &= \left(\left[\partial_{x^l}, \left[\partial_{x^j}, \tilde{X} \right] \right], \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{x^l}} \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{x^j}} \tilde{\alpha} \right) \\ &= \left(- \left[\tilde{X}, [\partial_{x^l}, \partial_{x^j}] \right] - \left[\partial_{x^j}, \left[\tilde{X}, \partial_{x^l} \right] \right], \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{x^l}} \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{x^j}} \tilde{\alpha} \right) \end{aligned}$$

by the Jacobi identity. Since $[\partial_{x^l}, \partial_{x^j}] = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\partial_{x^j}} \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{x^l}} \tilde{\alpha} = \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{x^l}} \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{x^j}} \tilde{\alpha}$, we conclude from (26),

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) B \partial_{x^l} (H^\top \beta_j) = \left(\left[\partial_{x^j}, \left[\partial_{x^l}, \tilde{X} \right] \right], \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{x^j}} \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{x^l}} \tilde{\alpha} \right) \\ &= \left[(\partial_{x^j}, 0), \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), (\tilde{X}, \tilde{\alpha}) \right] \right] \\ &= \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) B \partial_{x^j} (H^\top \beta_l). \end{aligned}$$

Define the $r \times 1$ matrix with C^∞ -entries in the variables $x^1, \dots, x^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi &= (\Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_r)^\top := -B \left[\int_0^{x^k} (H^\top \beta_k)(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, \tau, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \right. \\ &\quad + \int_0^{x^{k-1}} (H^\top \beta_{k-1})(x^1, \dots, x^{k-2}, \tau, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \\ &\quad + \dots + \int_0^{x^1} (H^\top \beta_1)(\tau, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \left. \right] \\ &= -(BR)(x^1, \dots, x^n), \end{aligned}$$

where $R(x^1, \dots, x^n)$ is the $r \times 1$ matrix in the parenthesis. Then for $l = 1, \dots, k$, we get

$$(28) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), \left((\tilde{X}, \tilde{\alpha}) + \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) \Pi \right) \right] \\ &= \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), (\tilde{X}, \tilde{\alpha}) \right] + \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) \Pi \right] \\ &= \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), (\tilde{X}, \tilde{\alpha}) \right] - \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) BR \right] \\ &= \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), (\tilde{X}, \tilde{\alpha}) \right] - \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) B (\partial_{x^l} R) \end{aligned}$$

by (5) and using the fact that $\left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) B$ is independent of $x^1, \dots, x^k$ (see the conclusion of Step 2). For any $l = 1, \dots, k$, we prove the identity

$$(29) \quad \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) B \partial_{x^l} R = \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) \beta_l$$

Indeed, since we can move freely $\left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B$ (a matrix depending smoothly on $x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n$) in and out of the integral signs in the computation below, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B \partial_{x^l} R \\
&= \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B \partial_{x^l} \left[\int_0^{x^k} (H^\top \beta_k)(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, \tau, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \right. \\
&\quad + \int_0^{x^{k-1}} (H^\top \beta_{k-1})(x^1, \dots, x^{k-2}, \tau, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \\
&\quad + \dots + \left. \int_0^{x^1} (H^\top \beta_1)(\tau, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \right] \\
&= \int_0^{x^k} \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B \partial_{x^l} (H^\top \beta_k)(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, \tau, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \\
&\quad + \int_0^{x^{k-1}} \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B \partial_{x^l} (H^\top \beta_{k-1})(x^1, \dots, x^{k-2}, \tau, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \\
&\quad + \dots + \int_0^{x^{l+1}} \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B \partial_{x^l} (H^\top \beta_{l+1})(x^1, \dots, x^l, \tau, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \\
&\quad + \partial_{x^l} \int_0^{x^l} \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B (H^\top \beta_l)(x^1, \dots, x^{l-1}, \tau, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \\
&\quad + \int_0^{x^{l-1}} \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B \partial_{x^l} (H^\top \beta_{l-1})(x^1, \dots, x^{l-2}, \tau, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \\
&\quad + \dots + \int_0^{x^1} \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B \partial_{x^l} (H^\top \beta_1)(\tau, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $(H^\top \beta_{m+1})(x^1, \dots, x^m, \tau, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n)$ doesn't depend on x^l for $m < l-1$, the last $l-1$ integrals in this expression vanish. Using (27) in the first $k-l$ integrals we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{x^k} \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B \partial_{x^k} (H^\top \beta_l)(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, \tau, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \\
&\quad + \int_0^{x^{k-1}} \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B \partial_{x^{k-1}} (H^\top \beta_l)(x^1, \dots, x^{k-2}, \tau, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \\
&\quad + \dots + \int_0^{x^{l+1}} \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B \partial_{x^{l+1}} (H^\top \beta_l)(x^1, \dots, x^l, \tau, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \\
&\quad + \partial_{x^l} \int_0^{x^l} \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B (H^\top \beta_l)(x^1, \dots, x^{l-1}, \tau, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) d\tau \\
&= \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r)\right) B \\
&\quad \times \left[\left((H^\top \beta_l)(x^1, \dots, x^k, \dots, x^n) - (H^\top \beta_l)(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) \right) \right. \\
&\quad + \left((H^\top \beta_l)(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) - (H^\top \beta_l)(x^1, \dots, x^{k-2}, 0, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) \right) \\
&\quad + \dots + \left. \left((H^\top \beta_l)(x^1, \dots, x^{l+1}, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) - (H^\top \beta_l)(x^1, \dots, x^l, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (H^\top \beta_l)(x^1, \dots, x^l, 0, \dots, 0, x^{k+1}, \dots, x^n) \Big] \\
& = \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) B(x^1, \dots, x^n) H^\top(x^1, \dots, x^n) \beta_l(x^1, \dots, x^n) \\
& = \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) \beta_l(x^1, \dots, x^n)
\end{aligned}$$

by (20). This proves (29).

From (29), (28), and (24) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
(30) \quad & \left[(\partial_{x^l}, 0), \left((\tilde{X}, \tilde{\alpha}) + \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) \Pi \right) \right] \\
& = \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) \beta_l - \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) \beta_l = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This identity suggests that the required section $(Z, \gamma) \in \Gamma(\mathcal{D})$ satisfying the third condition in the statement of the proposition is

$$(Z, \gamma) := ((X_1, \alpha_1), \dots, (X_r, \alpha_r)) \Pi = \sum_{l=1}^r (X_l, \alpha_l) \Pi_l \in \Gamma(\mathcal{D}).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
(Z, \gamma) & = ((\bar{X}_1, 0), \dots, (\bar{X}_r, 0)) \Pi + \left((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r) \right) \Pi \\
& = \sum_{l=1}^r (\bar{X}_l, 0) \Pi_l + \sum_{l=1}^r (\tilde{X}_l, \tilde{\alpha}_l) \Pi_l,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{X} := \sum_{j=1}^k a^j \partial_{x^j}$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Set in the same manner $\bar{X}_i = \sum_{j=1}^k X_i^j \partial_{x^j} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{J})$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$, and verify (iii) in the statement of the theorem. For any $l = 1, \dots, k$, since $\partial_{x^1}, \dots, \partial_{x^k}$ is a basis of the space of sections of $\mathcal{J}$ over U , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
[(X + Z, \alpha + \gamma), (\partial_{x^l}, 0)] & = \left[(\bar{X}, 0) + \sum_{k=1}^r (\bar{X}_k, 0) \Pi_k, (\partial_{x^l}, 0) \right] + \left[(\tilde{X}, \tilde{\alpha}) + \sum_{k=1}^r (\tilde{X}_k, \tilde{\alpha}_k) \Pi_k, (\partial_{x^l}, 0) \right] \\
& \stackrel{(30)}{=} \left[(\bar{X}, 0) + \sum_{k=1}^r (\bar{X}_k, 0) \Pi_k, (\partial_{x^l}, 0) \right] + 0 \in \Gamma(\Theta)
\end{aligned}$$

since, by construction, $\bar{X}, \bar{X}_i \in \Gamma(\mathcal{J})$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, so that $\bar{X} + \sum_{k=1}^r \bar{X}_k \Pi_k \in \Gamma(\mathcal{J})$. Since $(\partial_{x^1}, 0), \dots, (\partial_{x^k}, 0)$ span the distribution Θ over U , we conclude that $[(X + Z, \alpha + \gamma), \Gamma(\Theta)] \subseteq \Gamma(\Theta)$ on U and (iii) in the statement is proved.

4. APPLICATIONS

4.1. Regular Dirac Reduction. In this section we apply Theorem 1 to the reduction of Dirac structures for group actions admitting a single orbit type. In addition, we present several situation in which the existence of descending sections is important.

Dirac structures. A *Dirac structure* (see [Cou90]) on M is a Lagrangian vector subbundle $\mathbf{D} \subset TM \oplus T^*M$. That is, $\mathbf{D}$ coincides with its orthogonal relative to (1) and so its fibers are necessarily $\dim M$ -dimensional.

The Dirac structure is *closed* or *integrable* if $[\Gamma(\mathbf{D}), \Gamma(\mathbf{D})] \subset \Gamma(\mathbf{D})$. Since $\langle (X, \alpha), (Y, \beta) \rangle = 0$ if $(X, \alpha), (Y, \beta) \in \Gamma(\mathbf{D})$, closedness of the Dirac structure is often expressed in the literature relative to a non-skew-symmetric bracket that differs from (3) by eliminating in the second line the third term of the second component. This truncated expression which satisfies the Jacobi identity but is no longer skew-symmetric is called the *Courant bracket*:

$$(31) \quad [(X, \alpha), (Y, \beta)] := ([X, Y], \mathcal{L}_X \beta - \mathbf{i}_Y \mathbf{d}\alpha).$$

A Dirac structure $\mathbf{D}$ on a manifold M defines two smooth tangent distributions $\mathbf{G}_0, \mathbf{G}_1 \subset TM$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_0(m) &:= \{X(m) \in T_m M \mid X \in \mathfrak{X}(M), m \in \text{Dom}(X), (X, 0) \in \Gamma(\mathbf{D})\} \\ \mathbf{G}_1(m) &:= \left\{ X(m) \in T_m M \mid \begin{array}{l} X \in \mathfrak{X}(M), m \in \text{Dom}(X), \text{ there exists} \\ \alpha \in \Omega^1(M) \text{ such that } (X, \alpha) \in \Gamma(\mathbf{D}) \end{array} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and two smooth cotangent distributions $\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}_1 \subset T^*M$ defined analogously.

Symmetries of a Dirac manifold $(M, \mathbf{D})$. Let G be a Lie group and $\Phi : G \times M \rightarrow M$ a smooth left action. Then G is called a *symmetry Lie group of* $(M, \mathbf{D})$ if for every $g \in G$ the condition $(X, \alpha) \in \Gamma(\mathbf{D})$ implies that $(\Phi_g^* X, \Phi_g^* \alpha) \in \Gamma(\mathbf{D})$. We say then that the Lie group G acts *canonically* or *by Dirac actions* on M . Note that we do not require that the action of G on M is faithful.

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a Lie algebra and $\xi \in \mathfrak{g} \mapsto \xi_M \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ be a smooth left Lie algebra action, that is, the map $(x, \xi) \in M \times \mathfrak{g} \mapsto \xi_M(x) \in TM$ is smooth and $\xi \in \mathfrak{g} \mapsto \xi_M \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is a Lie algebra anti-homomorphism. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is said to be a *symmetry Lie algebra of* $(M, \mathbf{D})$ if for every $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ the condition $(X, \alpha) \in \Gamma(\mathbf{D})$ implies that $(\mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} X, \mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} \alpha) \in \Gamma(\mathbf{D})$. Of course, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is the Lie algebra of G and $\xi \mapsto \xi_M$ the infinitesimal action map induced by the G -action on M , then if G is a symmetry Lie group of $\mathbf{D}$ it follows that $\mathfrak{g}$ is a symmetry Lie algebra of $\mathbf{D}$.

Reduction of Dirac structures. Assume that the G -action on the Dirac manifold $(M, \mathbf{D})$ is canonical, free and proper. Then both vector bundles $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathcal{K}^\perp$ (see (2) and the definitions below) are G -invariant and it is shown in [JR08] following [BCG07] that, under the assumption that $\mathbf{D} \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ is a vector bundle on M , the “quotient”

$$(32) \quad \mathbf{D}_{\text{red}} = \frac{(\mathbf{D} \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp) + \mathcal{K}}{\mathcal{K}} \Big/ G$$

defines a Dirac structure on M/G , called the *reduced Dirac structure*.

Historically, the first method to reduce Dirac structures is due to [Bla00] and [BvdS01] (see [BR04] for a corresponding singular reduction method). The reduced Dirac structure on M/G is given by

$$(33) \quad \bar{\mathbf{D}} = \text{span} \left\{ (\bar{X}, \bar{\alpha}) \in \Gamma(T\bar{M} \oplus T^*\bar{M}) \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists X \in \mathfrak{X}(M) \text{ such that } X \sim_\pi \bar{X} \\ \text{and } (X, \pi^* \bar{\alpha}) \in \Gamma(\mathbf{D}) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Although this is just the formulation of (32) in terms of smooth sections, the proofs in [Bla00] and [BvdS01] use an additional hypothesis in order to guarantee that the construction above yields a Dirac structure: $\mathcal{V} + \mathbf{G}_0$ has to have constant rank on M . This, together with the involutivity of the vector subbundle $\mathcal{V}$, is needed in their proof in order to be able to use results in [NvdS90] and [Isi95]. The cited result of [Isi95] (and of [NvdS90] with a stronger hypothesis; see also [CT89]) is exactly the statement of Theorem 1 in the next section applied to the involutive subbundle $\mathcal{V}$ of TM and the tangent distribution $\mathbf{G}_0$ (identified with $\mathbf{G}_0 \oplus \{0\}$). The first main goal of this note, contained in the following theorem, is to show that the existence of a reduced Dirac structure on the smooth quotient $\bar{M} := M/G$ follows from weaker assumptions than in both [BCG07] and [Bla00], [BvdS01]. In particular, the hypothesis on the constancy of the rank of the distribution $\mathcal{V} + \mathbf{G}_0$ is not needed.

Theorem 2. *Assume that the Lie group G acts properly and canonically on the Dirac manifold $(M, \mathbf{D})$ with all its isotropy subgroups conjugated. If $\mathbf{D} \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ has constant rank on M , then the Dirac structure $\mathbf{D}$ on M induces a Dirac structure $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$ on $\bar{M}$ whose fiber at every point $\bar{m} \in \bar{M}$ is given by*

$$(34) \quad \bar{\mathbf{D}}(\bar{m}) = \left\{ (\bar{X}(\bar{m}), \bar{\alpha}(\bar{m})) \in T_{\bar{m}} \bar{M} \times T_{\bar{m}}^* \bar{M} \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists X \in \mathfrak{X}(M) \text{ such that } X \sim_\pi \bar{X} \\ \text{and } (X, \pi^* \bar{\alpha}) \in \Gamma(\mathbf{D}) \end{array} \right\}.$$

If $\mathbf{D}$ is closed, then $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$ is also closed.

For the proof of this, we need a the following lemma concerning descending sections of the Dirac structure $\mathbf{D}$, which is a corollary of Theorem 1.

Lemma 1. *If $\mathbf{D} \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ is locally finitely generated then it is spanned by its descending sections.*

Remark 1. Note that if $D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ is smooth, it has constant rank on M by Proposition 2. Thus we have the equivalence of the three following statements:

- (1) $D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ has constant rank on M
- (2) $D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ is locally finitely generated
- (3) $D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ is spanned by its descending sections.

Hence the hypothesis on $D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ in the preceding theorem is not as restrictive as it may seem.

Proof of the lemma. The vertical space $\mathcal{V}$ of the action spanned by the fundamental vector fields $\{\xi_M \mid \xi \in \mathfrak{g}\}$ is constant dimensional and involutive. Since the action of G on (M, D) is canonical, we have for each section $(X, \alpha) \in \Gamma(D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)$ and each $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$,

$$[(\xi_M, 0), (X, \alpha)] = ([\xi_M, X], \mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} \alpha) = (\mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} X, \mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} \alpha) \in \Gamma(D).$$

Since α is a section of $\mathcal{V}^\circ$, an easy computation shows

$$(\mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} \alpha)(\eta_M) = -\alpha([\xi, \eta]_M) = 0$$

for all $\eta \in \mathfrak{g}$. Hence, $\mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} \alpha \in \Gamma(\mathcal{V}^\circ)$ and we get $[(\xi_M, 0), (X, \alpha)] \in \Gamma(D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)$. Any $V \in \Gamma(\mathcal{V})$ has an expression of the form $V = \sum_{i=1}^k f_i \xi_M^i$, where $f_1, \dots, f_k$ are smooth functions and $\xi^1, \dots, \xi^k$ is a basis of $\mathfrak{g}$. Thus, using the fact that α is an element of $\Gamma(\mathcal{V}^\circ)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} [(V, 0), (X, \alpha)] &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^k f_i [\xi_M^i, X] - \sum_{i=1}^k X(f_i) \xi_M^i, \mathcal{L}_{\sum_{i=1}^k f_i \xi_M^i} \alpha \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (f_i [\xi_M^i, X] - X(f_i) \xi_M^i), \sum_{i=1}^k f_i \mathcal{L}_{\xi_M^i} \alpha \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k f_i [(\xi_M^i, 0), (X, \alpha)] - \sum_{i=1}^k X(f_i) (\xi_M^i, 0) \in \Gamma((D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp) + \mathcal{K}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ is locally finitely generated and $\mathcal{V}$ is an involutive subbundle of TM , using Theorem 1, we find for each $m \in M$ a neighborhood U of m and smooth sections $(X_1, \alpha_1), \dots, (X_r, \alpha_r)$ of $D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ defined on U satisfying the following condition: $(X_1(m'), \alpha_1(m')), \dots, (X_r(m'), \alpha_r(m'))$ span $(D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)(m')$ for all $m' \in U$, α_i is G -invariant (see the proof of Corollary 2), and $[X_i, \Gamma(\mathcal{V})] \subseteq \Gamma(\mathcal{V})$, $i = 1, \dots, r$. $\square$

Proof of the theorem. We have to show that $\bar{D}$ given in (34) is a Dirac structure on $\bar{M}$. We begin with the inclusion $\bar{D} \subseteq \bar{D}^\perp$. Let $(\bar{X}, \bar{\alpha}), (\bar{Y}, \bar{\beta}) \in \Gamma(\bar{D})$. Then we find $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ such that $X \sim_\pi \bar{X}$, $(X, \pi^* \bar{\alpha}) \in \Gamma(D)$ and $Y \sim_\pi \bar{Y}$, $(Y, \pi^* \bar{\beta}) \in \Gamma(D)$. For any $\pi(m) \in \bar{M}$ we have

$$\langle (\bar{X}, \bar{\alpha}), (\bar{Y}, \bar{\beta}) \rangle(\pi(m)) = \bar{\alpha}(\bar{Y})(\pi(m)) + \bar{\beta}(\bar{X})(\pi(m)) = (\pi^* \alpha)(Y)(m) + (\pi^* \beta)(X)(m) = 0,$$

since $(X, \pi^* \bar{\alpha}), (Y, \pi^* \bar{\beta}) \in \Gamma(D)$. Thus $(\bar{X}, \bar{\alpha}) \in \Gamma(\bar{D})$ implies $(\bar{X}, \bar{\alpha}) \in \Gamma(\bar{D}^\perp)$ which, in view of the definition of the smooth orthogonal, is equivalent to $\bar{D} \subseteq \bar{D}^\perp$.

For the converse inclusion $\bar{D}^\perp(\bar{m}) \subseteq \bar{D}(\bar{m})$, $\bar{m} \in \bar{M}$, choose $(\bar{X}, \bar{\alpha}) \in \Gamma(\bar{D}^\perp)$ defined on a neighborhood $\bar{U}$ of $\bar{m}$ in $\bar{M}$ and a G -invariant smooth vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ such that $X \sim_\pi \bar{X}$ (whose existence is guaranteed by the considerations at the end of subsection 2.2). Choose $m \in \pi^{-1}(\bar{m})$. For each descending section (Y, β) of $D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ defined on a neighborhood $U \subseteq \pi^{-1}(\bar{U})$ of m , there exists a section $(\bar{Y}, \bar{\beta})$ of $\bar{D}$ defined on the neighborhood $\pi(U)$ of $\bar{m}$ in $\bar{M}$ such that $Y \sim_\pi \bar{Y}$ and $\pi^* \bar{\beta} = \beta$. For each $m' \in U$, we get

$$\langle (\bar{X}, \bar{\alpha}), (\bar{Y}, \bar{\beta}) \rangle(\pi(m')) = \bar{\alpha}(\bar{Y})(\pi(m')) + \bar{\beta}(\bar{X})(\pi(m')) = 0,$$

since $(\bar{X}, \bar{\alpha}) \in \Gamma(\bar{D}^\perp)$. Hence, as above, we get

$$\langle (X, \pi^* \bar{\alpha}), (Y, \beta) \rangle(m') = \bar{\alpha}(\bar{Y})(\pi(m')) + \bar{\beta}(\bar{X})(\pi(m')) = 0$$

and since, by Lemma 1, $D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ is spanned by its descending sections, it follows that $(X, \pi^* \bar{\alpha}) \in \Gamma((D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)^\perp)$.

Again, using that $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ has constant rank on M and the fact that $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{K}^\perp$ are vector subbundles of $\mathcal{P}$, we know that

$$\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{D}^\perp \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)^\perp = (\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)^\perp.$$

Hence, $(X, \pi^* \bar{\alpha})$ can be written as $(X', \pi^* \bar{\alpha}) + (V, 0)$ with smooth vector fields V and X' such that $V \in \Gamma(\mathcal{V})$ and $(X', \pi^* \bar{\alpha}) \in \Gamma(\mathcal{D})$. Because $V \in \Gamma(\mathcal{V})$, we have the equality $\bar{X}(\pi(m')) = T\pi(X(m')) = T\pi(X'(m') + V(m')) = T\pi(X'(m'))$ for all $m' \in U$, and hence $X' \sim_\pi \bar{X}$. This shows that $(\bar{X}, \bar{\alpha}) \in \Gamma(\bar{\mathcal{D}})$.

Let $(\bar{X}, \bar{\alpha}), (\bar{Y}, \bar{\beta}) \in \Gamma(\bar{\mathcal{D}})$ and assume that the Dirac structure $\mathcal{D}$ is closed. There exist (X, α) and $(Y, \beta) \in \Gamma(\mathcal{D})$ such that $X \sim_\pi \bar{X}$, $Y \sim_\pi \bar{Y}$, $\pi^* \bar{\alpha} = \alpha$, and $\pi^* \bar{\beta} = \beta$. Since $\mathcal{D}$ is closed, the Courant bracket $([X, Y], \mathcal{L}_X \beta - \mathbf{i}_Y \mathbf{d}\alpha)$ is also a section of $\mathcal{D}$. Since we have $[X, Y] \sim_\pi [\bar{X}, \bar{Y}]$ and $\pi^* (\mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}} \bar{\beta} - \mathbf{i}_{\bar{Y}} \mathbf{d}\bar{\alpha}) = \mathcal{L}_X \beta - \mathbf{i}_Y \mathbf{d}\alpha$, it follows immediately that $[(\bar{X}, \bar{\alpha}), (\bar{Y}, \bar{\beta})] = ([\bar{X}, \bar{Y}], \mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}} \bar{\beta} - \mathbf{i}_{\bar{Y}} \mathbf{d}\bar{\alpha})$ is a section of $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$. $\square$

4.2. Further applications. If we apply Theorem 1 to $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{T} \oplus \{0\} \subseteq TM \oplus \mathcal{T}^\circ$ with a locally finitely generated tangent distribution $\mathcal{T}$, we get the following result.

Corollary 1. *Let $\mathcal{J} \subset TM$ be an involutive vector subbundle of TM and $\mathcal{D}$ a smooth locally finitely generated tangent distribution on M . Assume that*

$$[\Gamma(\mathcal{D}), \Gamma(\mathcal{J})] \subseteq \Gamma(\mathcal{J} + \mathcal{D}).$$

Let X be a vector field on M satisfying

$$[X, \Gamma(\mathcal{J})] \subseteq \Gamma(\mathcal{J} + \mathcal{D}).$$

Then for each $m \in M$ there is an open set $U \subseteq M$ with $m \in U$ and smooth $\mathcal{D}$ -valued vector fields $Z, Z_1, \dots, Z_r$ on U satisfying

- (i) $\mathcal{D}(m') = \text{span}\{Z_1(m'), \dots, Z_r(m')\}$ for all $m' \in U$,
- (ii) $[Z_i, \Gamma(\mathcal{J})] \subseteq \Gamma(\mathcal{J})$ on U for all $i = 1, \dots, r$, and
- (iii) $[X + Z, \Gamma(\mathcal{J})] \subseteq \Gamma(\mathcal{J})$ on U .

This is Proposition A1 in the appendix of [JR08] generalizing the result of [CT89].

We have also the following corollary which is essential in showing that the assumptions on $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ required in Theorem 2 are always satisfied if the Dirac structure on M is defined as the graph of a Poisson structure on M .

Corollary 2. *Let $\mathcal{V}$ be the vertical space of a proper action with conjugated isotropy groups. Then its smooth annihilator $\mathcal{V}^\circ$ admits locally G -invariant spanning sections.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{V}$ is the vertical space of a proper action with conjugated isotropy groups it is an involutive vector subbundle of TM . Thus, its smooth annihilator $\mathcal{V}^\circ$ also has constant rank on M and is therefore locally finitely generated.

For each $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $\alpha \in \Gamma(\mathcal{V}^\circ)$, we have $\mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} \alpha = \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{i}_{\xi_M} \alpha) + \mathbf{i}_{\xi_M} \mathbf{d}\alpha = 0 + \mathbf{i}_{\xi_M} \mathbf{d}\alpha \in \Gamma(\mathcal{V}^\circ)$, because $\mathbf{d}\alpha(\xi_M, \eta_M) = \xi_M(\alpha(\eta_M)) - \eta_M(\alpha(\xi_M)) + \alpha([\xi, \eta]_M) = 0$ for all $\eta \in \mathfrak{g}$. Write any $V \in \Gamma(\mathcal{V})$ as $V = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i \xi_M^i$, with $f_1, \dots, f_n \in C^\infty(M)$ and $\xi^1, \dots, \xi^n \in \mathfrak{g}$, and get for each $(0, \alpha) \in \Gamma(\{0\} \oplus \mathcal{V}^\circ)$

$$[(V, 0), (0, \alpha)] = \left(0, \mathcal{L}_{\sum_{i=1}^n f_i \xi_M^i} \alpha\right) = \left(0, \sum_{i=1}^n f_i \mathcal{L}_{\xi_M^i} \alpha\right) \in \Gamma(\{0\} \oplus \mathcal{V}^\circ).$$

Theorem 1 yields hence, for each $m \in M$, the existence of spanning sections $(0, \alpha_1), \dots, (0, \alpha_r)$ for $\{0\} \oplus \mathcal{V}^\circ$ on a neighborhood of m , such that $(0, \mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} \alpha_i) = [(\xi_M, 0), (0, \alpha_i)] \in \Gamma(\mathcal{V} \oplus \{0\})$ for each $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$. But this implies $\mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} \alpha_i = 0$ and thus

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Phi_{\exp(t\xi)}^* \alpha_i = \Phi_{\exp(t\xi)}^* (\mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} \alpha_i) = 0.$$

This relation and connectedness of G imply $\Phi_g^* \alpha = \alpha$ for all $g \in G$. Since $(0, \alpha_1), \dots, (0, \alpha_r)$ span $\{0\} \oplus \mathcal{V}^\circ$ on a neighborhood of m , the G -invariant sections $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r \in \Gamma(\mathcal{V}^\circ)$ span $\mathcal{V}^\circ$ on the same neighborhood of m . $\square$

In the special case of a Poisson manifold with a proper Lie group action having all its isotropy subgroups conjugated, the next corollary shows that all hypotheses for Theorem 2 are satisfied. Hence there always exists an induced Poisson structure on the reduced space M/G .

Corollary 3. *Let $(M, \{\cdot, \cdot\})$ be a Poisson manifold and $D \subseteq TM \oplus T^*M$ the Dirac structure defined by $D(m) = \text{span}\{(\sharp\alpha(m), \alpha(m)) \mid \alpha \in \Omega^1(M)\}$, where $\sharp : T^*M \rightarrow TM$, $\mathbf{d}f \mapsto \{f, \cdot\}$ is the homomorphism of vector bundles induced by $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$. Let G be a Lie group acting properly and canonically on M having all its isotropy subgroups conjugated. Then the generalized distribution $D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ is spanned by its descending sections.*

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{V} \oplus \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{K}^\perp = TM \oplus \mathcal{V}^\circ$, and note that G acts on $(M, \{\cdot, \cdot\})$ by Poisson actions if and only if G acts on (M, D) by Dirac actions. The generalized distribution $D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ can be written as $\text{span}\{(\sharp\alpha, \alpha) \mid \alpha \in \Gamma(\mathcal{V}^\circ)\}$. From Corollary 2, we know that $\mathcal{V}^\circ$ is generated by its G -invariant sections and hence we have $D(m) \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp(m) = \text{span}\{(\sharp\alpha(m), \alpha(m)) \mid \alpha \in \Gamma(\mathcal{V}^\circ)^G\}$ for all $m \in M$. Since G acts on $(M, \{\cdot, \cdot\})$ by Poisson actions, the vector field $\sharp\alpha$ corresponding to a G -invariant one-form α is automatically G -invariant (see for example [JR09] for a proof of this fact). Hence, $D \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp$ is generated by its descending sections. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [BCG07] H. Bursztyn, G. R. Cavalcanti, and M. Gualtieri, *Reduction of Courant algebroids and generalized complex structures.*, Adv. Math. **211** (2007), no. 2, 726–765 (English).
- [Bla00] G. Blankenstein, *Implicit Hamiltonian Systems: Symmetry and Interconnection*, Ph.D.Thesis, University of Twente, 2000.
- [BR04] G. Blankenstein and T. Ratiu, *Singular reduction of implicit Hamiltonian systems*, Rep. Math. Phys. **53** (2004), no. 2, 211–260. MR MR2068644 (2005k:37126)
- [BvdS01] G. Blankenstein and A. J. van der Schaft, *Symmetry and reduction in implicit generalized Hamiltonian systems*, Rep. Math. Phys. **47** (2001), no. 1, 57–100. MR MR1823009 (2002e:37083)
- [Cou90] T.J. Courant, *Dirac manifolds.*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **319** (1990), no. 2, 631–661 (English).
- [CT89] D. Cheng and T.J. Tarn, *New result on (f, g) -invariance.*, Syst. Control Lett. **12** (1989), no. 4, 319–326 (English).
- [Dui] J.J. Duistermaat, *Dynamical systems with symmetry*, Available at <http://www.math.uu.nl/people/duis/>.
- [Isi95] A. Isidori, *Nonlinear Control Systems*, third ed., Communications and Control Engineering Series, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995. MR MR1410988 (97g:93003)
- [JR08] M. Jotz and T. Ratiu, *Dirac and nonholonomic reduction*, arXiv:0806.1261v2 (2008).
- [JR09] Madeleine Jotz and Tudor S. Ratiu, *Poisson reduction by distributions*, Lett. Math. Phys. **87** (2009), no. 1-2, 139–147. MR MR2480650
- [JRS09] M. Jotz, T. Ratiu, and J. Sniatycki, *Singular reduction of Dirac structures*, arXiv:0901.3062v3 (2009).
- [NvdS90] H. Nijmeijer and A. van der Schaft, *Nonlinear Dynamical Control Systems.*, New York etc.: Springer-Verlag. xiii, 467 p. DM 98.00 , 1990 (English).
- [RO06] Miguel Rodríguez-Olmos, *The isotropy lattice of a lifted action*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **343** (2006), no. 1, 41–46. MR MR2241957 (2007e:53113)

Madeleine Jotz, SECTION DE MATHÉMATIQUES, ECOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE, 1015 LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND

E-mail address: madeleine.jotz@epfl.ch

Tudor S. Ratiu, SECTION DE MATHÉMATIQUES, ET CENTRE BERNOUILLI, ECOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE, 1015 LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND

E-mail address: tudor.ratiu@epfl.ch